

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

7 KENNETH VENTRELLA,)
8 Plaintiff(s),) Case No. 2:12-cv-01450-LRH-NJK
9 vs.)
10 TRUMP RUFFIN TOWER I, LLC, et al.,) ORDER DENYING REQUEST
11 Defendant(s).) TO EXTEND DISCOVERY
DEADLINES (Docket No. 46)

)

Pending before the Court appears to be a stipulation to extend discovery deadlines, *see Docket No. 46 (“Second Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order”)*, which is hereby **DENIED**. The pending request has a number of deficiencies. First, a request to extend discovery deadlines shall be made by motion or stipulation. *See Local Rule 26-4; see also Docket No. 30.* The pending request is fashioned as a discovery plan. Second, requests for extension must be supported by a showing of good cause if filed more than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline, and by a showing of excusable neglect if filed less than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline. Local Rule 26-4; *see also Docket No. 30.* The pending request does not attempt to make such a showing.¹ Third, “[a]ny motion or stipulation to extend a deadline or to reopen discovery shall include[, *inter alia*,]: (a) A statement specifying the discovery completed; (b) A specific description of the discovery that remains to be completed; [and] (c) The reasons why the deadline was not satisfied or the remaining discovery was not completed within the time limits set by the discovery plan.” Local Rule 26-4; *see also Docket No. 30.* The pending request fails to do so.

¹ The pending request also misstates Local Rule 26-4's timing requirements for requesting an extension of discovery deadlines. See Docket No. 46 at 4.

The Court has already specifically reminded counsel of the above requirements. *See* Docket No. 30. Nonetheless, counsel failed to take heed of these instructions. Counsel are again reminded of these requirements and are hereby ORDERED to file any future requests for discovery-related extensions in accordance with the requirements outlined above and in the Local Rules. Future failure to abide by this Order or the Local Rules may result in the imposition of sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 11, 2013

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge